## Approved For Release 2002/05/09 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000600070035-5

## SECRET

PPB 70-1567 2 9 JUL 1970

MEMORANDUM FOR: Executive Director-Comptroller

SUBJECT

: Inter-Directorate Rotation

REFERENCE

: Memo to ExDir from D/Pers dtd 24 Jul 70; same subject

- 1. I would wholeheartedly agree with Bob Wattles' reservations about drawing "any far-reaching conclusions" concerning the relevance of the statistical data which he presents. I am not even sure what near-term conclusions I would draw. For example, he notes that a substantial segment of the statistical data applies to the assignment of Support careerists to positions in other Directorates. For many years, this has been the modus operandi of the Support services, and we have come to expect this as a way of life. We would be surprised if it were not the case.
- 2. I don't feel that the general concern over the level of professional rotation among Directorates has been focused upon the lack of opportunities for rotating Support careerists among all the Directorates. They exist in rather substantial numbers. Rather, I think, it has been directed toward the relatively few opportunities for rotation of professionals and specialists among the substantive Directorates -- Plans, Intelligence, and Science and Technology. These statistics give only a modicum of insight into that segment of our personnel development policies.
- 4. The question, of course, is: "What is a proper percentage?"
  The answer hinges upon identification of the reasons why we might think that a substantial number of reassignments among career services is a good thing and a goal toward which we should strive. One might reason that an actual change in career service designation is possibly prima facie evidence of a failure in the original career designation mechanism.

25**Y**Q

## **SECRET**

- 5. If personnel development as opposed to career management responsibility is a primary justification for rotation among the three substantive Directorates, it would seem that this should occur outside the framework of the "change in career designation" mechanism. Figures presented by Wattles do not show the three-year record in this area, but as of 30 April 1970 there were 4 DD/P careerists assigned to the Intelligence Directorate and 1 to the S&T Directorate; 43 Intelligence Directorate careerists in the Plans Directorate and 4 in the S&T Directorate; 41 S&T careerists (35 are assigned to S&T positions) in the Plans Directorate and 4 in the Intelligence Directorate. This reflects an inter-Directorate rotation of 97 people. However, 36 of these are offset by positions designated to their own parent career service. Thus, we really had on 30 April 1970 a net rotation base among the three substantive Directorates of about 61 people -- or again something less than How many of these 61 people will ever return to their parent Directorates where their experience and knowledge gained can be put to profitable use is not determinable.
- 6. In short, I don't think that these statistics unquestionably support the contention that there is a greater volume of exchange of substantive professional personnel among the three line Directorates than most of us realize unless something less than is a higher ratio than we imagined. I have an intuitive feeling that as an Agency, we could afford and would gain from a rotation ratio nearer. This could be a useful way of getting production from a man while he is in "training."
- 7. I am fearful that wide circulation of "shotgun" statistics of this variety may lend support to a feeling of complacency -- a sort of measurement of the progress of the "war" through "body count" without really knowing whose bodies we are counting, who is doing the counting, or even how many bodies it will take to win the "war."

(signed) John M. Clarke

John M. Clarke
Director of Planning,
Programming, and Budgeting

Orig - ExDir (ret. D/PPB)
(1)- ER

25X9

25X9

25X9